REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated April 14, 2009. Applicants have also filed herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6, 7, 13, 18 and 19 have been currently amended. Support for these amended claims can be found on pages 2, 12, 17 and 41-45 of the specification. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by the amended claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 7-17 and 19-24, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,811,379 (hereinafter the '379 patent), alone, or, alternatively, as evidenced by U.S. Patent 4,704,491 (hereinafter the '491 patent). Applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

The '379 patent does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed. The '379 patent does not teach or suggest "homogeneous substantially linear, liquid low molecular weight ethylene/alpha-olefin polymers" as claimed, or "homogeneous substantially linear, gel-like, low molecular weight ethylene/alpha-olefin polymers" as claimed. These copolymers are prepared using a constrained geometry polymerization catalyst, and have from about 0.01 to about 3 long chain branches per 1000 carbon atoms (see pages 2, 12, 17, 33-36 (catalysts 1, 2 and 3), 39 and 44 of the present application). In addition, these copolymers are characterized by a molecular weight distribution which is independent of the I10/I2 ratio (see page 2 of the present application).

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the late-transition-metal catalyst systems disclosed in the '379 patent would not produce the claimed homogeneously branched substantially linear ethylene/alpha-olefin polymers with long chain branching. Also, the '379 patent does not desire polymers containing long chain branches, since such branching can alter the hydrodynamic volume of the polymer chain, and thus, alter the dispersancy of the polymer (see column 20, lines 20-37). The '379 patent teaches that most of the molecular weight of the polymer

should be incorporated into the polymer backbone, and not into branches, and that the branches preferably contain only one to four carbon atoms (see column 20, lines 29-37). Then'491 patent does not overcome the deficiencies of the '379 patent.

For at least the above reasons, the '379 patent does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed. Applicants request the withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected Claims 6 and 18, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as anticipated by the '379 patent, alone, or as further evidence by the '491 patent and Wittcoff et al., *Industrial Organic Chemical*, 2nd edition, 2004, 498-499 (hereinafter the Wittcoff reference). Applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

As discussed above, the '379 patent does not teach or suggest "homogeneous substantially linear, liquid, low molecular weight ethylene/alpha-olefin polymers" as claimed, or "homogeneous substantially linear, gel-like, low molecular weight ethylene/alpha-olefin polymers" as claimed. Neither the '491 patent nor the Wittcoff reference overcome the deficiencies of the '379 patent. Applicants request the withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present amendment is now in condition for allowance. If further issues remain, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call Applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY

Date: July 14, 2009

/Jane M. Terry/
Jane M. Terry
Registration No. 53,682
Phone: 979-238-3424
P. O. Box 1967
Midland, MI 48641-1967

JMT/lb